

REMARKS

Claims 12 and 14-21 are pending in the Application. Claim 12 has been amended.

*Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102*

The Patent Office rejected claims 12, 17-19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,623,499 by Ko et al., ("Ko").

*Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103*

The Patent Office rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 5,623,499 by Ko et al., ("Ko") in view of U.S. Publication 20030093608 by Jaramillo et al., ("Jaramillo").

The Patent Office rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 5,623,499 by Ko et al., ("Ko") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,675,244 by Elliot et al., ("Elliot").

The Patent Office rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 5,623,499 by Ko et al., ("Ko") in view of block size by Microsoft Computer Dictionary ("MSCD").

The Patent Office rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 5,623,499 by Ko et al., ("Ko") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,546,507 by Coyle et al., ("Coyle").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 12 and 14-21. Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration. *W.L. Gore & Assocs. v. Garlock*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 851 (1984). Further, “anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim.” *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (citing *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983)). Emphasis added. Additionally, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Ryoka*, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974). *See also In re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494 (C.C.P.A. 1970).


Applicant respectfully submits claim 12 recites elements which have not been disclosed, taught or suggested by Ko. For example, claim 12 generally recites building a state machine from the first and second states, the state machine being capable of executing at least one function, the at least one function being implemented in code common to multiple parameters, wherein the at least one function includes editing, storing, loading, and displaying. Emphasis added. Ko fails to disclose, teach or suggest building a state machine from the first and second states, the state machine being capable of executing at least one function, the at least one function being implemented in code common to multiple parameters, wherein the at least one function includes editing, storing, loading, and displaying. Jaramillo, Elliot and Coyle fail to cure the defects of Ko. Consequently, claim 12 should be allowed. Claims 14-21 should be allowed due to their dependence upon an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

The application is respectfully submitted to be in condition for allowance.  
Accordingly, notification to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
LSI Logic, Inc.,

Dated: April 30, 2007

By:   
Chad W. Swantz  
Reg. No. 46,329

SUITER · SWANTZ PC LLO  
14301 FNB Parkway, Suite 220  
Omaha, NE 68154  
(402) 496-0300      telephone  
(402) 496-0333      facsimile